10/19/83 R4800-2 A

MISSING

Because more than a million children are abducted or run away from home each year, a growing number of school districts are fingerprinting pupils and taking steps to prevent kidnappings.

See Page 6.

MEETING

A bill for a summit conference on education has passed in the House and is before the Senate, but Secretary Bell, saying that the resulting session would be "too late," has scheduled his own summit meeting for early December.

See Page 13.

MANDATING

Efforts to initiate educational reforms are progressing in Illinois, Utah, and Wisconsin, as special committees and education leaders call for more rigorous academic programs, merit pay for teachers, and more productive school days.

See Pages 5, 8, and 9.

EDUCATION WEEK

American Education's Newspaper of Record Volume III, Number 7 · October 19, 1983

© 1983 Editorial Projects in Education

Fiscal Health of Urban Districts Tied to Costs of Teaching Poor

By Peggy Caldwell

The ability of urban school districts to identify and address the higher costs incurred in educating poor children may be the major determinant of their fiscal health in the coming years, according to a draft report of a new study by the U. S. Education Department's School Finance Project.

The districts most likely to meet that challenge, according to the report, are characterized by higher-than-average per-pupil expenditures, heavy reliance on local revenue sources, and low proportions of children under 5 years of age.

And, not surprisingly, the prospects for large-city districts correlate closely with the outlook for the states in which they are situated, although the research team did find exceptions. Some districts with otherwise poor prospects were upgraded, the report says, because they can reasonably expect to benefit from their states' better outlook.

The report, "The Financing of Urban Public Schools: A Report on Selected School Systems," which is expected to be issued in final form within a month, is a supplement to the project's assessment of state prospects for funding education. Both are part of a comprehensive, four-volume study of school finance ordered by the Congress in 1978.

The urban-schools study is based on 1980 data from 44 districts, including five county districts that take in large cities. The sample represented about 13 percent of the nation's public-school children in 1979-80 and over half the systems enrolling more than 50,000 pupils, according to the report.

A district characterized as having "good prospects" cannot necessarily expect to see its absolute level of resources increase; instead, it is one that is considered likely to maintain or improve its average per-pupil expenditure over time. Hence, an expected increase in enrollment is considered a burden, since it is unlikely that resources will be increased accordingly; stable or declining enrollment is seen as an advantage.

"You couldn't say the cities were so broke that they needed help for school purposes, because [the situation] varied so much," said Esther O. Tron, principal author of the report. "It was the composition of the pupil population that might require more re-

Continued on Page 18

Chicago teachers continued their strike last week, with negotiations at an impasse over salary issues. The union seeks a 10-percent raise, and the board is offering .5 percent and reduced benefits. Oakland, Calif., teachers ended their strike after winning an average increase of 7 percent.

President Urges 'Partnerships' With Schools

Directs Federal Agencies To 'Adopt' a School

By Thomas Toch

WASHINGTON—In an effort to "break down the walls around schools and open them up to the public's attention and involvement," President Reagan last Thursday urged businesses, government agencies, and communities to form "partnerships" with every school and community college in the country by the end of the school year.

"Everyone must get involved," he said at a White House ceremony. He proclaimed 1983-84 the "National Year of Partnerships in Education" and announced his intention to sign a memorandum directing all federal agencies to "adopt" a school.

To dramatize his point, the President announced that the White House will adopt the Congress Heights Elementary School—a predominantly black public school in the District of Columbia. The ceremony was broadcast live by closed-circuit television to the newly adopted school.

Alluding to Americans' "love affair with learning" and evoking the names of Thom-

Continued on Page 15

Two Companies To Offer Computers Specifically for Schools

By Charlie Euchner

As the American microcomputer market was experiencing what experts called the early stages of a "shakeout," two companies were launching the first U. S. efforts to develop and market computers designed specifically for education.

Acorn Computers Ltd., the major manufacturer of computers for schools in Great Britain, this month initiated a marketing effort in this country that officials predicted would enable the company to attract 10 percent of the education market within the next year.

At the same time, officials of a new Virginia-based company called the National Information Utilities Corporation (N.I.U.C.) were studying the possibility of developing a computer system specifically for education.

N.I.U.C. officials said the company has had discussions with Intel Corporation, a major manufacturer of microchips, about collaborating on such a project. The N.I.U.C. is expected to make a public offering of its stock soon.

Terry Herndon, formerly executive director of the National Education Association and now director of a study of the education market for the N.I.U.C., said the new company might attempt to develop computer systems that would link school computers with each other and with large databases across the country.

Intel officials have expressed an interest in "moving from the chip business to the systems business," Mr. Herndon said. The N.I.U.C. and Intel have not decided whether they would produce a new computer or incorporate available technology into a complete educational system.

N.I.U.C. officials have consulted many education organizations, such as the Minnesota Educational Computing Consortium and the New York City Board of Education, about what features an educational computer would need to be useful.

Acorn officials, meanwhile, said their machine's $995 pricetag should make their computer competitive with the major

Continued on Page 15

COMPUTERS

Teachers of computer courses have long suspected that computers encourage students to work together rather than separately. Researchers say they now have evidence to confirm that suspicion.

Marion Perlmutter, professor of child development at the University of Minnesota, says an experiment involving preschool children revealed that children work together more when they use computers than when they work on other projects.

After giving 60 3- and 5-year-old students about 30 minutes of instruction in using the keyboard and other features of a computer, researchers at the university's Child Care Center allowed students to use computers during their daily one and one-half hours of free time. The researchers observed 60 students for three days a week over a nine-week period.

The average child spent about 75 percent of his time on the computer working with other children, Ms. Perlmutter and her research associate, Alexandra Muller, found.

Most children of that age spend little time working with their classmates, Ms. Perlmutter said. When students worked on jigsaw puzzles, they spent only about 10 percent of the time with other children. The way students worked on the computer, she said, "was not very typical of preschoolers."

Prior to starting the research last fall, Ms. Perlmutter said, she shared the reluctance of many educators to introduce the computer to such young children. She said she thought such children might be able to use only computers that had speech-synthesizers. But she said students learned to use the keyboard quickly.

Ms. Perlmutter said she would expand her research to other preschool programs in the Minneapolis area over the next three years with a $70,000 grant from the National Institute of Education. The new research will concentrate on "problem-solving skills" as well as the social environment that computers create.

□

A growing number of guidance counselors have begun to use computers to analyze the capabilities of their students and how those capabilities can be put to work in classes and the workplace. Two projects in California now offer comprehensive information on such uses.

The Santa Clara County office of education is updating its directory of computer software produced for guidance counselors. The next edition will be available in January. The book is believed to be the only compilation of information about guidance software.

The H. B. McDaniel Foundation in Fullerton, Calif., is funding a study of the issues that guidance counselors will face in the next 20 years. The educators working on the project—led by H. B. Gelatt, the director of the Future Directions Project at Stanford University—released their first findings this summer.

□

The year is 1994, and President Daniel Patrick Moynihan finds the public-school system in dire need of federal support. Public schools enroll only 13.2 percent of all students nationwide—a situation that has resulted from the proliferation of microcomputers in society and the passage of tuition-tax credit legislation.

That is the vision of Robert C. Snider, a research assistant for the National Education Association. In one of 11 articles about computers in education published in this month's *Phi Delta Kappan*, the monthly magazine of the education fraternity, Mr. Snider warns that computers could undermine all of education.

The microcomputer is such a revolutionary machine, Mr. Snider fears, that it could transform schools into places where only "the most visible technological underclass of the 1990's will be found."

Among the other topics covered in the *Kappan* issue devoted to computers in education: the extent to which tommorow's economy will demand "computer literacy" from today's students; the advantages of learning by computer; the task of implementing computer use in the school; the role of the teacher in computer learning; and the use of computers to conduct daily school business.

□

Secondary schools generally have supported training for their mathematics and science teachers to enable them to teach computer-science courses. Now at least one college has formally embraced that practice.

Clarkson College in Potsdam, N. Y., this summer used a $216,000 grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to retrain faculty members in the sciences to serve as computer-science instructors. The two-year program is run by the Mathematical Association of America and the Association for Computing Machinery.

The National Institute for Retraining in Computer Science includes faculty members from the University of California at Berkeley, Carnegie-Mellon University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

□

Notes: The Annenberg/C.P.B. Project—a program funded by the Annenberg School of Communications and run by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—has announced grants for studies of technology and education. The Electronic Text Corporation will conduct a $1-million study of ways in which electronic text and graphics can be used in higher education. The University of South Florida will use a $200,000 grant to investigate the usefulness of electronic-mail courses, such as the those offered by a new company called TeleLearning Systems Inc. *(See Education Week, Sept. 21, 1983.)*. . . . The new Miss Teen of America, Denise Wallace, is a computer-science major at Bradford University in Bradford, Va. Ms. Wallace, 18, won a $15,000 scholarship in the competition. . . . Schools in the Yukon-Koyukuk School District in Nenana, Alaska, district are experimenting with a battery pack to supply electricity for microcomputers. The 12-volt battery will be used in areas where the electrical current is not consistent enough for computers to operate without "crashes." —C.E.

DATABANK

The States' Reports on Asbestos in Schools

The following table is from a U. S. Education Department report to the Congress. A copy of the unreleased report, dated Sept. 25, was made available to Education Week.

		Total number of schools	Total schools inspected	Total schools with asbestos problems	Number of schools with asbestos hazard abated, by treatment: Removal	Enclosure	Encapsulation	Special operation, maintenance	Total schools with hazard remaining	Total square footage detected: Already abated	Yet to be abated
Alabama	Public	1,465	Full report expected to be ready in August 1983.								
	Non-public	249									
Alaska	Public	466	Report contained no data to be tabulated.								
	Non-public	36									
Arizona[1]	Public	866									
	Non-public	221	373	372	1						
Arkansas	Public	1,186	1,186	172	7	23	44	98			
	Non-public	114	52	30							
California	Public	7,440	Report contained no data to tabulate.								
	Non-public	2,415									
Colorado	Public	1,289	Was not reported.								
	Non-public	229									
Connecticut	Public	1,030		170+	38						
	Non-public	333	No data to tabulate on nonpublic schools.								
Delaware	Public	159									
	Non-public	82	No data reported by schools								
District of Columbia	Public	184		5			5				
	Non-public	93		3							
Florida	Public	2,111			Mostly removed		Some			1.6M+	3M
	Non-public	824	No data reported on nonpublic schools.								
Georgia	Public	1,823		36		Last report was in 1981.			27		
	Non-public	334	No data reported on nonpublic schools.								
Hawaii	Public	230	230	81	81				None	1.396M	
	Non-public	114									
Idaho	Public	561	Not in compliance on reports								
	Non-public	46									
Illinois	Public	5,261	4,171	894	141	48	219	25			
	Non-public	1,344	1,244	296	16	125	30				
Indiana	Public	2,666	2,666	721	2	2	14	8			
	Non-public	462	462	No other data on nonpublic schools.							
Iowa[2]	Public	1,751	1,751	277	Not in compliance on reports. These data are from 1981.						
	Non-public	287	No data on nonpublic schools.								
Kansas	Public	2,298	2,298	477					375		
	Non-public	253	253	36					24		
Kentucky	Public	1,388	Not in compliance on reports.								
	Non-public	286									
Louisiana	Public	1,568	No data to tabulate.								
	Non-public	437									
Maine	Public	819	No data to tabulate.								
	Non-public	113									
Maryland	Public	1,322	No data to tabulate.								
	Non-public	371									
Massachusetts	Public	1,919	Reports contained no data to tabulate.								
	Non-public	513									
Michigan	Public	3,867							69	60,856 sq. ft.	1.977M sq. ft.
	Non-public	663							None		
Minnesota	Public	1,851	No data submitted.								
	Non-public	487									
Mississippi	Public	1,080	Reports contain no data to tabulate.								
	Non-public	168									
Missouri	Public	2,173	Reports contain no data to tabulate.								
	Non-public	556									

		Total number of schools	Total schools reporting asbestos inspections	Total schools with asbestos problems	Number of schools with asbestos hazard abated, by treatment: Removal	Enclosure	Encapsulation	Special operations & maintenance	Total schools with hazard abatement underway	Total square footage detected: Already abated	Not yet abated
Montana	Public	782	No data submitted.								
	Non-public	78									
Nebraska	Public	1,677	Not in compliance on reports.								
	Non-public	227									
Nevada	Public	284	Report contains no data to tabulate.								
	Non-public	38									
New Hampshire	Public	450 buildings	171 buildings		11 LEAs						Unknown
	Non-public	102	No reports on nonpublic schools.								
New Jersey	Public	2,360	Not in compliance on reports.								
	Non-public	629									
New Mexico	Public	634	496	142						1,956,800 detected	
	Non-public	110	No data submitted on nonpublic schools.								
New York	Public	4,074	All reports contained no data on detection or control activities.								
	Non-public	1,907									
North Carolina	Public	2,014	1,115	286	49	1	64	53			Not known
	Non-public	293	No data on nonpublic schools.								
North Dakota	Public	825	Not in compliance on reports								
	Non-public	64									
Ohio	Public	3,925	No data on detection or control activities								
	Non-public	871									
Oklahoma	Public	1,947	1,947								
	Non-public	82	131	1						1.116M	
Oregon	Public	1,289	Report contained no data to tabulate.								
	Non-public	183									
Pennsylvania	Public	3,197	3,197	939							
	Non-public	373	373	67							
Rhode Island	Public	302	326 in 1978	37	3		1	15			
	Non-public	117	No data submitted for nonpublic schools.								
South Carolina	Public	1,148	978	190							
	Non-public	203									
South Dakota	Public	742									
	Non-public	108									
Tennessee	Public	1,780	1,780	332	10		7				
	Non-public	290	68	Data are from 1981.							
Texas	Public	5,593	317 LEAs	197 LEAs	34 LEAs						
	Non-public	659	No data submitted on nonpublic schools.								
Utah	Public	603	373								
	Non-public	26	No data submitted on nonpublic schools.								
Vermont	Public	426									
	Non-public	62									
Virginia	Public	135 LEAs	108 LEAs	63 LEAs						43 LEAs	
	Non-public	361	No data submitted on nonpublic schools.								
Washington	Public	1,765	1,765								
	Non-public	330	No data on nonpublic schools.								
West Virginia	Public	1,145	State report gave no data on detection and control activities.								
	Non-public	86									
Wisconsin	Public	2,134	There was abatement in 70 schools in 1981.								
	Non-public	909	No data reported on nonpublic schools.								
Wyoming	Public	392									
	Non-public	30	No data on nonpublic schools.								
American Samoa		No report submitted.									
Guam		No report submitted.									
Puerto Rico		No report submitted.									
Trust Territory		281 public and nonpublic. Some schools inspected in one area. No data.									
Northern Mariana Islands	Public	13	11	1						1	
	Non-public	No data on nonpublic schools.					0				
Virgin Islands	Public	34									
	Non-public										

Sources: Data shown for the number of public schools were either supplied by the state reports, or were entered from the *Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary School Systems-Schools, Pupils and Staff: Fall 1980*. U.S. Education Department, National Center for Education Statistics.

Data shown for the number of nonpublic schools were either supplied by the state reports, or were entered from the table, *Number of Private Elementary and Secondary Schools, by Type of School and by State: Fall, 1980*. U.S. Education Department, National Center for Education Statistics.

[1] The state of Arizona reported 372 private schools have been inspected, however the Education Department's records indicate that only 221 nonpublic schools are located within the state (per notes above).

[2] The state of Iowa reported more schools inspected than Education Department records indicate are operated by the state (per notes above).

Report's Additional Remarks On Status of State Compliance

The following "additional notes on the individual state reports" were included by the Education Department in its unreleased report to the Congress on asbestos-control efforts involving schools.

Alabama's State Building Commission has contracted with Safe-State, a University of Alabama consulting service, to inspect, sample, and analyze all suspected asbestos material in the public elementary and secondary schools. A report is expected in September 1983.

Alaska, as of July 1983, reported that some LEA's (Local Education Agencies) have inspected their buildings and some asbestos has been found.

Arizona said that since the E.P.A. does not require schools to report to their SEA (State Education Agency), its data are most likely not complete. Of the 372 nonpublic schools reporting friable asbestos, only 52 submitted samples for analysis.

Arkansas reported that of its 370 LEA's, 358 had reported to the SEA; 172 had buildings with asbestos and 74 of these had taken corrective action by June 1983, and 43 had deferred action.

California's report contained no data to be tabulated.

Colorado's report contained no data to be tabulated. The Service Employees International Union survey reported that almost all Colorado schools with asbestos problems have taken appropriate action.

Connecticut has 100 LEA's in which 170 buildings were suspected of having asbestos; 40 of the 170 buildings needed immediate removal of the asbestos; 36 removal projects have been completed or were in process (June 1983). No data were reported on the nonpublic schools.

Delaware gave no data on its nonpublic schools. All inspections were made under the pre-May 1982 rules.

District of Columbia reported it has surveyed all of its schools and found friable asbestos in 5 public-school buildings and 3 nonpublic-school buildings. The hazard has been abated by encapsulation in the public schools.

Florida requires annual inspection of all elementary and secondary schools and community colleges for hazardous asbestos. Prior to July 1, 1980, 1,608,374 square feet of hazardous material was removed. In 1980-81, Florida appropriated $6.5 million for this purpose; in 1981-82, $3.9 million. Except for problems in Wakulla, Broward, and Orange counties, all hazardous asbestos has been removed or is now being removed.

Georgia's report (July 1981) was incomplete, aside from the failure to provide data on the nonpublic schools. No later report.

Hawaii reported that it removed all the hazardous asbestos from all of its public schools at a cost of $10.1 million. No data were reported on the nonpublic schools.

Idaho had not reported as of early August 1983.

Illinois sent to E.D. a copy of the report it made to comply with the E.P.A. rule. The data are still incomplete.

Indiana reported that it had screened all of its schools, public and nonpublic. However, the data from its several reports are conflicting and incomplete. There was no report of corrective actions by the nonpublic schools.

Iowa's most recent report was submitted in 1981 and was incomplete. It included no mention of its nonpublic schools.

Kansas indicated that it has all the data for its public and nonpublic schools, and can supply the data in a specific format, if requested.

Kentucky in 1981 reportedly inspected its schools, public and nonpublic, and knew which ones had asbestos. It reportedly had records on all aspects of the asbestos control activity. However, its report to the Secretary gave no figures to indicate exactly what had been done.

Louisiana's summary report *was* to have been mailed on June 28, 1983. It has not arrived. Louisiana "lends assistance" to its LEA's for asbestos detection in all school buildings, public and parochial.

Maine provides 50-50 matching funds to its LEA's for asbestos detection, and has legislation pending to provide 90-percent state funding for repair or removal of asbestos in its public schools. No data were provided on the nonpublic shcools.

Maryland reportedly is in "full compliance" and for every public school, a detection program has been undertaken and the SEA has information on "related control activities and the date that these activities were completed." No data were submitted for tabulation.

Massachusetts submitted no data on its schools, public or nonpublic, in its three reports, which were strictly "descriptions of activities" in accordance with the state plan.

Michigan expected to submit a full report in August 1983.

Minnesota reported no data on asbestos detection or control.

Mississippi's descriptive report provided no data on detection or control.

Missouri submitted no data on asbestos detection or control in its summary report.

Montana submitted no detection or control data.

Nebraska submitted no summary report.

New Hampshire described what it has done, with a minimum of hard data. Corrective actions have ranged in cost to LEA's from "several thousand to over two million dollars."

New Jersey submitted no reports.

New Mexico estimated it would cost $3.9 million to abate its asbestos problems by encapsulation at $2.50 per square foot, and $12.6 million as the cost of removal at $8.00 per square foot.

New York reported to be complying, but its descriptive reports include no data.

North Carolina supplied no data on its nonpublic schools.

North Dakota has not submitted its report.

Ohio has been active but its report included no data.

Oklahoma said all of its 7,000 buildings have been "surveyed," 70 of its LEA's found asbestos problems, and 47 of the LEA's have removed the hazardous material. About 1.117 million square feet have been removed at a cost of $2.992 million. Only 4 LEA's now have problems, and they are to be corrected soon.

Oregon, on July 12, 1983, promised " a full accounting shortly."

Pennsylvania reported that the state has paid $5,890,367 for abatement and expects to pay an additional $6,234,095.

Rhode Island reported all LEA's have inspected all their schools and that it has "exceeded" the requirements of the Asbestos School Hazard Detection and Control Act of 1980.

South Carolina. Of its 978 "schools," 190 have been found to have friable asbestos, and in 50 schools "removal or abatement" activities have been undertaken.

South Dakota. Of the 195 public LEA's and 137 nonpublic school systems, 111 have made the inspections, and 38 found asbestos. Most of the data submitted cannot be tabulated.

Tennessee reported "100 per cent attainment" in its detection program for public schools undertaken in 1981. Of the nonpublic schools, 22 percent have participated in the program. At least 12 LEA's have taken some corrective action.

Texas. The Texas records are incomplete.

Utah's report showed some voluntary activity, but no data were provided on control activities that can be tabulated.

Vermont has not submitted a plan or reports.

Virginia's report showed that of 63 LEA's with asbestos, 20 "have corrected asbestos" and "43 have uncorrected asbestos." They expected to have a final report by the end of summer 1983.

Washington. All of its 300 LEA's "completed and filed a report of their building survey."

West Virginia reportedly has surveyed "all its school systems during 1982 and 1983 concerning the status of asbestos detection and control," however, they did not report the results to E.D.

Wisconsin has not complied with the reporting requirement.

Wyoming reported that all but 11 of its 49 LEA's have reported regarding the presence of asbestos.

American Samoa. No report submitted.

Guam. No report submitted.

Puerto Rico. No report submitted.

Trust Territory said all of its 6 "local agencies" have "reported" and that only one found asbestos, supposedly not hazardous. The reporting cannot be considered definitive.

Northern Mariana Islands reported that it has 13 public shcools, of these the one with asbestos is now closed. No data were supplied on any nonpublic school.

Virgin Islands contracted with a firm to do the inspection of its schools to perform the analysis of suspected friable materials, and to make recommendations for corrective action. The firm had not performed these tasks as of July 15, 1983, and legal action to force its compliance was being contemplated.

Urban Districts' Financial Health Linked to Costs of Educating Poor

Continued from Page 1

sources. I think that's the way to handle the problem. . . . We should concentrate on the kinds of kids who go to those schools."

By 1980, the pupil composition of the sample districts had already changed considerably, and the trend is expected to continue.

"Over the decade, the population of large cities has become less wealthy, with an increased concentration of minorities and a growing incidence of elderly," the report says. "Urban school systems reflect some similar demographic features: they are increasingly composed of children who are poor and from minority backgrounds. . . . What is clear is that central cities have a high incidence of educationally needy children and that their numbers are likely to grow."

In the majority of the sample cities, public-school enrollment declined by more than 20 percent—or nearly twice the national average—between 1969 and 1979. But the rapid decline produced a financial cushion for many cities, particularly those that were not heavily reliant on enrollment-driven state aid, leading to increased per-pupil expenditures. By 1978-79, all but four of the sample cities had per-pupil expenditures at least equal to their states' averages.

At the same time, however, the cities became poorer, as measured by per-capita income, with urban income declining relative to states' average income.

The study included two other dimensions in its analysis of funding prospects: the proportion of children living in poverty (the national average is 4.5 percent) and the proportion of children under age 5 (the national average is 7.2 percent). Where the proportions exceeded the national averages, districts were presumed to be "burdened."

"To what extent cities will be able or willing to raise additional revenues for schools may be the critical issue," the report says. "The current urban population composition does not suggest a strong constituency for increasing school taxes. In addition, cities are constrained in levying taxes on businesses because of concerns about business flight. While at the present time most central-city school districts in the sample appear to have favorable levels of expenditures per pupil, it is likely that more than average resources are needed to educate their student populations."

The final factor in the analysis was "weighting" expenditures to reflect each district's proportion of poverty-level students. Drawing on the practices of several states that provide extra aid for such children, the researchers concluded that it costs about 25 percent more than the average to educate a child from a poverty-level family.

Ms. Tron cautioned that the study does not take into account developments since 1980, such as Proposition 2 ½ in Massachusetts and cuts in federal aid, that might have affected the fiscal position of the districts.

Based on expenditures, state prospects, and demographic factors as of 1980, the researchers categorized the sample districts according to prospects for funding and identified characteristics common to each of the categories.

The types of districts and salient characteristics are:

• **Districts with good prospects.** These spent more than 10 percent above the national per-pupil average in 1980 and maintained this advantage even when the expenditure was weighted to reflect incidence of poverty in the district. Per-capita income in these cities is around the state average, but revenue efforts are higher. These districts tend to rely heavily on local revenue for schools (which is why they are higher-than-average spenders) and are best able to absorb declines in state and federal aid. Most have lower-than-average incidence of children under 5, suggesting they will not be strained by sudden enrollment increases. They tend to be located in the northern half of the country and in states with good or average funding prospects.

Examples: Denver, Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, Seattle.

• **Districts with average prospects.** These were spending within 10 percent of the national average or more than 10 percent above average, but the high incidence of poverty offset that advantage. They did tend, however, to spend well above their states' averages. They include four of the five county districts in the sample and are located in the Midwest, Southeast, and West.

Examples: Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N. C., Dallas, Indianapolis, St. Louis.

• **Districts with poor prospects.** These spent more than 10 percent below the national average or spent close to the average but "appear seriously deficient when their excess incidence of poor children is taken into account." They tend to have per-capita incomes below their state averages and higher-than-average tax efforts, and they tend to be located in states with poor fiscal prospects.

Nearly all the districts in this category had higher-than-average incidences of children under 5, and several were in the Southeast, where state equalization formulas tend to work to the disadvantage of the relatively wealthier cities.

Examples: Hartford, New Orleans, Newark, Salt Lake City.

Cities With Good Funding Prospects

	Local share of school expenditure	Compared to State Averages: Incidence of children in poverty	Per capita income	Per capita own-source revenue	Aggregate revenue effort	Incidence of children under 5	State prospects
Boston	60%	200%	88%	152%	174%	5.3%	Good
Cleveland	38	230	79	129	164	7.8	Average
Denver	63	130	105	149	139	6.7	Average
Kansas City, Mo.	58	110	109	129	120	7.2	Average
Milwaukee	43	200	98	86	87	7.8	Good
Minneapolis	50	110	105	95	89	6.0	Good
New Castle County (Wilmington)	34	90	110	—	—	6.7	Good
Pittsburgh	51	140	95	109	113	5.3	Average
Portland	64	110	109	110	103	6.5	Good
Providence	63	190	91	113	127	6.3	Good
Richmond	66	160	95	160	169	6.0	Average
Seattle	28	80	117	128	112	4.9	Good
Washington	80	140[1]	123[1]	—	—	5.4	—

[1] Compared to national average.

Cities With Poor Funding Prospects

	Local share of school expenditure	Compared to State Averages: Incidence of children in poverty	Per capita income	Per capita own-source revenue	Aggregate revenue effort	Incidence of children under 5	State prospects
Baltimore	39%	250%	72%	98%	138%	6.7%	Good
Birmingham	44	110	99	163	163	7.5	Poor
Detroit	37	240	81	103	127	7.9	Good
Hartford	57	370	66	137	211	7.8	Good
Houston	56	80	122	103	84	7.9	Poor
Kansas City, Kansas	41	180	89	64	74	8.2	Average
Memphis	52	160	105	68	65	7.7	Poor
New Orleans	34	150	104	120	120	7.9	Poor
New York	49	150	97	128	132	6.7	Good
Newark	16	400	56	56	104	8.7	Good
Tulsa	52	80	129	133	103	7.3	Average
Salt Lake City	60	110	116	161	138	8.9	Poor
San Antonio	27	160	79	49	62	8.6	Poor

Cities With Average Funding Prospects

	Local share of school expenditure	Compared to State Averages: Incidence of children in poverty	Per capita income	Per capita own-source revenue	Aggregate revenue effort	Incidence of children under 5	State prospects
Albuquerque	21%	60%	121%	115%	95%	7.8%	Average
Atlanta	51	160	98	185	184	7.1	Poor
Buffalo	36	150	79	128	52	6.6	Good
Chicago	49	210	89	88	99	7.7	Good
Cincinnati	55	190	95	140	148	7.5	Average
Columbus	45	140	94	91	97	7.6	Average
Clark County (Las Vegas)	26	110	97	—	79	7.2	Poor
Dade County (Miami)	35	100	103	—	—	5.8	Average
Dallas	57	95	119	107	90	7.4	Poor
Indianapolis	36	130	107	96	90	7.6	Poor
Jefferson County (Louisville)	42	70	123	—	—	7.3	Poor
Los Angeles	15	150	102	86	85	[illegible]	Average
Mecklenburg County (Charlotte)	42	80	127	—	—	[illegible]7	Poor
Oakland	15	160	93	96	103	6.9	Average
Omaha	69	110	108	84	77	7.2	Average
Philadelphia	38	210	85	159	186	6.4	Average
San Diego	31	100	98	70	72	6.4	Average
St. Louis	44	220	85	158	186	7.1	Average

Talks Break Down in Boston

Continued from Page 11

fered the teachers' union a 3-percent raise in the first year of the contract and 5-percent raises for each of the two remaining years.

The union has demanded an 8-percent increase for each year of the contract, according to the department's report.

On seniority, the department is requesting what it terms "limited rights" for principals to select teachers on the basis of qualifications. School principals would be allowed to select one of three senior teachers who are qualified for the open position.

The school department has proposed continuing teacher benefits under the health and welfare fund but reducing the city's contribution because, according to the report, the fund now has a $7-million surplus.

The city's teachers are now required to be at work 15 minutes before classes begin; the school department wants up to five additional hours each month for inservice sessions and faculty meetings and two evenings a year for conferences with parents, the report explained.

The department is also seeking to increase the work schedule of teachers from 180 days to 182.5 days. "This would allow planning for the school year before opening day, as well as end the practice of deducting inservice training from students' class time," the report asserted.

EDUCATION WEEK is available in Microform.

University Microfilms International

Please send additional information for _____ (name of publication)
Name _____
Institution _____
Street _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

300 North Zeeb Road
Dept. P.R.
Ann Arbor, Mich. 48106